

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

DeJuan Haywood Haggins,

Court File No. 13-cv-503 (DWF/LIB)

Plaintiff,

v.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

State of Minnesota et al,

Defendants.

DeJuan Haywood Haggins (Plaintiff) commenced this action by filing a civil Complaint, [Docket No. 1], and an application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP). [Docket No. 2].

Under the Court's Order of March 6, 2013, [Docket No. 3], Plaintiff was required either to pay the full \$350.00 filing fee for this action, or to file an Amended IFP Application accompanied by "a separate affidavit that fully explains the settlement of his claims in Haggins v. Sherburne County, No. 10-2554 (DWF/LIB)," no later than April 5, 2013. (Id. at 2 (emphasis in original)). As of today's date, Plaintiff has not made any payment toward the filing fee, nor has he made an Amended IFP Application accompanied by the required affidavit.

Based on the Court's express warning regarding the consequences that would follow if Plaintiff failed to comply with the Court's Order of March 6, 2013, [Docket No. 3], and for the reasons more fully stated in that Order, it is now recommended that Plaintiff be deemed to have abandoned this action, and that the action be dismissed without prejudice. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) (actions may be dismissed for failure to comply with court orders); Henderson v. Renaissance Grand Hotel, 267 Fed. Appx. 496, 497 (8th Cir. 2008) (unpublished opinion) ("[a] district court

has discretion to dismiss an action under Rule 41(b) for a plaintiff's failure to prosecute, or to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or any court order").

Based upon the above, and upon all the files, records and proceedings herein,

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:

1. That the Plaintiff's Complaint [Docket No. 1] be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**, for failure to comply with this Court's Order of March 6, 2013, [Docket No. 3], and for lack of prosecution.

Dated: April 24, 2013

s/Leo I. Brisbois
LEO I. BRISBOIS
United States Magistrate Judge

N O T I C E

Pursuant to Local Rule 72.2(b), any party may object to this Report and Recommendation by filing with the Clerk of Court, and serving all parties **by May 8, 2012**, a writing that specifically identifies the portions of the Report to which objections are made and the bases for each objection. A party may respond to the objections within fourteen days of service thereof. Written submissions by any party shall comply with the applicable word limitations provided for in the Local Rules. Failure to comply with this procedure may operate as a forfeiture of the objecting party's right to seek review in the Court of Appeals. This Report and Recommendation does not constitute an order or judgment from the District Court, and it is therefore not directly appealable to the Court of Appeals.